

IDA

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

Engaging East Asia's Changing Defense Elites

Michael Green
Kondang Oh
with
William E. Cralley
James Delaney

September 1996

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

IDA Document D-1924

Log: H 96-003339

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

19970130 003

This work was conducted under IDA's independent research program. The publication of this IDA document does not indicate endorsement by the Department of Defense, nor should the contents be construed as reflecting the official position of that Agency.

© 1996 Institute for Defense Analyses, 1801 N. Beauregard Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1772 • (703) 845-2000.

This material may be reproduced by or for the U.S. Government.

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

IDA Document D-1924

**Engaging East Asia's Changing
Defense Elites**

Michael Green
Kondang Oh
with
William E. Cralley
James Delaney

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

PREFACE

This study was completed under IDA's Independent research program within the Strategy, Forces and Resources Division.

The report was written by Michael Green and Katy Oh based on an initial concept developed by James Delaney. The assessments contained here reflect research conducted in Washington and trips made to the region by Michael Green (Japan and Singapore), Jim Delaney (Japan), Kondang Oh (Korea), and Bill Cralley (Korea).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ES-1
I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
II. JAPAN	II-1
A. The Strategic Outlook	II-1
B. The Strategic Community	II-4
C. Conclusions.....	II-9
III. REPUBLIC OF KOREA	III-1
A. Trends In Strategic Thinking	III-1
B. Korea's Strategic Research And Policy Analysis Organizations.....	III-4
C. Potential Collaboration Partners For IDA.....	III-7
IV. SINGAPORE	IV-1
A. Introduction.....	IV-1
B. Singapore's Strategic Outlook	IV-1
C. Singapore's Strategic Community	IV-5
D. Conclusions.....	IV-6
V. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	V-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study examines the impact of East Asia's changing national security establishments for U.S. regional strategy and considers the opportunities for IDA to develop second-track exchanges with emerging counterpart institutions in the region. The study focuses on Japan, Korea, and Singapore.

- In Japan, there is a growing pluralization in defense policy making, with the Japan Defense Agency (JDA) and Japan Self Defense Forces (JSDF) growing more influential relative to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), but with politicians and think tanks also playing a greater role. The study notes that the April 1996 U.S.-Japan Security Declaration resulted from a conscious DoD effort to engage this broader strategic community while working with traditional counterparts in the JDA and MOFA, and concludes that further second track dialogue with Japan would support DoD strategy in areas such as counterproliferation and armaments cooperation.
- In Korea, the Kim Young Sam era has heralded a new confidence and political liberalization, but it also has led to unprecedented purges in the national security community. The net result points to a more democratic and open Korea, but a demoralized military and an increasingly unpredictable and testy defense relationship with the United States. KIDA and other research institutes are growing more independent and assertive and are actively seeking collaborative relationships with IDA. IDA has also worked with the Seoul Forum and other organizations in Korea to address issues such as bilateral crisis planning with the DoD. IDA's work with KIDA could help to weave a broader and more reliable net in the U.S.-ROK security relationship.
- Singapore has a small but sophisticated security policy community and a clear strategy aimed at keeping the U.S. "engaged" in South East Asia without any of the political complications of "presence." Uncertainty about China and Japan (and U.S. staying power) have moved Singapore subtly closer to the United States in recent years, and the rest of ASEAN is quietly following. Second track dialogue with new Singaporean defense institutes would help to cement U.S.

strategic "engagement" without pushing official commitments that would represent "presence."

The study concludes with some tentative recommendations for establishing a framework at IDA for nurturing second track dialogue with counterpart institutions in the region.

I. INTRODUCTION

National security establishments are changing in East Asia. The traditional counterparts of the U.S. Department of Defense in Tokyo, Seoul, and Southeast Asia are adjusting to the consequences of political pluralism, economic growth, and the strategic transition from the bipolarity of the Cold War to a regional power balance that lies somewhere between multi- and unipolarity. In some cases, such as Korea, the Ministry of Defense is increasingly isolated and disconnected. In others, such as Japan and Singapore, the defense bureaucracies are playing a greater role in strategic and even diplomatic policy making. In all three countries, new centers of strategic thinking and new constituencies are influencing defense policy.

For the U.S. Department of Defense, these trends present both a challenge and an opportunity. The challenge will be to maintain close coordination of defense policies and support for the U.S. military presence with friends and allies in the region at a time when their own political systems and decision-making patterns are in flux. The opportunity will be to tap into the expanding strategic policy communities in these countries to establish new patterns of security cooperation in the region.

The Department of Defense is well positioned to engage the broader national security communities in East Asia through second-track strategic dialogue and planning. To a significant degree, the DoD's Japan Initiative of 1995-96 (the "Nye Initiative") built on second-track exchanges among IDA, the National Defense University (NDU), the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), and similar organizations in Japan.¹ These efforts were closely coordinated with the U.S. and Japanese governments and served to advance themes that later were incorporated in the April 1996 U.S.-Japan Joint Declaration on Security. On the multilateral stage, U.S. and regional non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have established a fruitful dialogue to parallel the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) through the Committee on Security Cooperation in the Asia

¹ The counterpart for CSIS was the Japan Institute for International Affairs, associated with the Foreign Ministry. Other counterpart organizations are listed later in this section.

Pacific (CSCAP). These early successes suggest that further second-track engagement of defense elites in East Asia could contribute significantly to DoD's mission in the region.

1. Objectives and Methodology

IDA funded a central research project in FY 1996 to explore the prospects for expanding second-track dialogue in this region in support of DoD's mission. The CRP sought to answer two questions:

- What is the impact of increasingly disconnected defense establishments and the emergence of new strategic centers of thinking in post-Cold War East Asia on U.S. security policy in the region?
- What are the opportunities for IDA to develop second-track dialogue with friends and allies in the region in support of DoD's regional security strategy?

The CRP focused on bilateral relations with Japan, Korea, and Singapore.

These countries were chosen for several reasons:

- All three are friends or allies, whose robust support for U.S. presence and regional strategy is essential to DoD's mission in the region;
- They are nations with which DoD can expect to expand bilateral defense cooperation in the future (such as joint planning, armaments cooperation, or training);
- They nations all face regional or domestic political obstacles to expanded defense cooperation with DoD which might necessitate a subtler second-track dialogue;
- All three have developed new centers of strategic planning outside the traditional national security establishment;
- In all three countries, the credibility of US forward military presence in the region is, if anything, increasingly linked to and dependent upon how effectively the US strategic community is seen as managing threats to peace and security in the region.
- Singapore, though not a major regional power on the order of Japan or Korea, does provide important support to U.S. security policy in the region and offers a useful strategic window on the rest of ASEAN (an important factor given limits on travel resources).

The authors chose not to examine second-track dialogue aimed at confidence-building measures with non-allies in this CRP because defense cooperation with friends and allies has a higher saliency to IDA's core competencies. It is important to point out,

however, that IDA researchers have been able to assist DoD as participants in second track dialogue with North Korean officials sponsored by US NGO's. These efforts have provided feedback to DoD on important issues such as POW/MIA and missile talks and could form an important part of IDA's work for DoD in the future. At this stage, however, the critical mass of IDA's capabilities (and therefore this CRP) are in the direction of strengthening defense cooperation with friends and allies.

Research was begun in Washington and travel to the region arranged for the spring and summer of 1996. Michael Green traveled to Japan in mid-April and Singapore in early June. Bill Cralley and Katy Kongdan Oh traveled to Korea in late June. A common set of research questions was addressed on each trip:

- What are the basic contours of each nation's defense policy and strategic relationship with the United States?
- What are the major think tanks, defense universities, industry associations, academic centers, and other organizations that have a role in defense and security policy making?
- What is the relationship of these organizations to the government and defense bureaucracies?
- What is the expertise of these organizations, and their general strategic outlook?
- How do experts in these organizations view regional security issues and defense cooperation with the United States?
- How could IDA engage these organizations in support of DoD strategy (particularly on issues that are not ready for formal government-to-government dialogue)? Candidate areas for increased engagement included:
 - defense industrial/technology cooperation
 - confidence building measures
 - refining bilateral roles and missions
 - building public acceptance for security ties with the U.S.
 - counterproliferation
 - military requirements
 - trilateral security
 - bilateral contingency and crisis planning
 - base/facilities access

- host nation support.

The Strategy, Forces and Resources Division already has incorporated the second-track approach into policy and acquisition-related tasks for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The results of this CRP suggest that research interaction with East Asian centers of defense expertise could become an increasingly important part of IDA's mission for the Department of Defense.

2. Organization

Chapter II of this study examines Japan's strategic outlook and national security community and summarizes ongoing IDA second-track efforts with counterparts in Tokyo. Chapter III outlines the strategic perspective from the Republic of Korea and assesses the changes in Seoul's national security community as they affect DoD strategy. Chapter IV examines Singapore. Chapter V presents recommendations for IDA to enhance its own second-track exchange with East Asian counterparts.

II. JAPAN

A. THE STRATEGIC OUTLOOK

IDA's second-track effort for DoD began in the spring of 1994 when the Senior Country Director for Japan in OSD organized a joint study by Japan experts associated with IDA and INSS. The study tracked the work being prepared at the time by a special advisory panel on defense convened by the Prime Minister of Japan to draft recommendations for a post-Cold War review of Japanese defense policy. The IDA/INSS team presented its findings to OSD and in "Redefining the U.S.-Japan Alliance," a monograph published by NDU.¹

The INSS/NDU study focused on the drift in U.S.-Japan defense relations that was apparent in the Japanese Prime Minister's defense advisory panel report. The defense advisory panel issued a strong endorsement for maintaining close U.S.-Japan security ties after the Cold War, but also emphasized the new importance to Japan of multilateral and independent security measures. According to the advisory panel, multilateralism would be the vehicle for Japan's contribution to regional security in the future (through participation in peace-keeping operations (PKOs) and multilateral confidence-building measures), while the U.S.-Japan Alliance would provide for the defense of Japan. From the standpoint of U.S. security policy, Japanese participation in multilateral confidence-building initiatives and peacekeeping operations was a desirable goal, but the overriding concern for U.S. military planners was joint U.S.-Japan responses to the kind of regional crisis that was only narrowly averted with North Korea a few months before the Japanese report. The defense advisory panel, which was mandated with charting Japan's long-term post-Cold War defense policy, avoided any treatment of the regional security role of the U.S.-Japan Alliance and bilateral defense cooperation.

This gap in U.S.-Japan strategic planning occurred at a time when political support for the bilateral alliance appeared to be at a post-war high, but the Japanese

¹ Patrick Cronin and Michael Green, "Redefining the U.S.-Japan Alliance: Tokyo's National Defense Program Outline (Fort McNair Paper No. 43) (Institute for National Security Studies: Washington, DC, 1994).

defense policy review revealed a growing disconnect between national security elites in the two countries. During the late 1970s and 1980s, the United States and Japan developed distinct, but mutually reinforcing, strategic doctrines. Officially, Japan focused on defending the home islands against direct Soviet attack, but implicitly the Japanese government prepared its self defense capabilities in a way that would bottle-up Soviet forces in the Far East. Japan was thereby able to contribute directly to U.S. global strategies of containment without upsetting domestic or regional constituencies concerned with Japanese power projection. This two-level strategic game required close coordination between Washington and Tokyo and rested on the deep mutual understanding that existed between a handful of elite officials in each government's national security bureaucracy.

By the time of the 1994 Defense Advisory Panel report in Tokyo, the Cold War alliance managers in each country had dispersed. At the same time, the collapse of the Soviet threat and the re-emergence of new threats to Northeast Asian security required careful consideration of how the U.S.-Japan Alliance would function in response to non-bipolar regional contingencies in the future. The external strategic environment and the internal policy-making process both had changed profoundly.

In the fall of 1994, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Joseph Nye, initiated a comprehensive strategic dialogue with his counterparts in the State Department, and the Japanese Defense Agency (JDA) and Foreign Ministry (MOFA). Through a series of documents--the U.S. East Asian Strategic Review (EASR-February 1995), the Japanese-revised National Defense Program Outline (NDPO-November 1995), and the U.S.-Japan Joint Declaration on Security (April 1996)--the two governments re-established mutually reinforcing doctrine for regional security in the post-Cold War era. The U.S. EASR began by emphasizing the importance of the U.S. Alliance to regional stability. The new Japanese NDPO developed this theme by replacing the previous NDPO's emphasis on defense against "limited, direct attack" with a commitment to work in the alliance to "respond to contingencies in the area around Japan that have an influence on Japanese security." This shift towards regional-oriented bilateral defense cooperation was consummated with the April Clinton-Hashimoto joint

declaration, which announced a review of the 1978 Guidelines for Defense Cooperation to address regional crises.²

The "Nye Initiative" helped to re-establish the traditional, close-working relationship of the alliance managers in State, DoD, JDA and MOFA, but it also revealed the new fluidity and pluralism of Japanese defense policy making. During the Cold War, Japanese politics had been polarized between the conservatives in the ruling Liberal Democratic Party and anti-military/anti-alliance leftists in the Socialist and Communist Parties. When the LDP lost its majority in 1993 and power shifted from one coalition government to the next over the following years, Japan's security policy arena was suddenly crowded with new political parties, think tanks, and journalists eager to make a mark. All were pro-alliance (only the Communist Party now opposes the alliance), but with a variety of nuanced prescriptions for Japanese defense policy.

Under its tasks for OSD, IDA research staff paralleled the official track of the Nye Initiative with second-track engagement of the broader Japanese security policy-making community on a number of issues, including: the future of U.S. bases; bilateral contingency planning; theater missile defense; regional security; dual-use technology and armaments cooperation; and counterproliferation³ While there is still room for debate about how much control institutions other than MOFA and JDA have on defense policy-making in Japan, there is no doubt that important and influential concepts and initiatives are increasingly emerging from outside the traditional national security bureaucracy. It is therefore likely that U.S. management of the alliance in the future will require not only close coordination with traditional counterparts in Tokyo, but also with new centers of strategic thinking in Japan. The most important elements of Tokyo's broadened national security establishment are listed below.

² The 1978 Guidelines for Defense Cooperation were non-binding studies between the U.S. and Japan on cooperation in times of attack on Japan. The studies established common ground for an expansion of bilateral training and planning, but never fully addressed contingencies beyond direct attack on Japan and, even in that, provided only broad guidance for planning.

³ IDA Task T-K6 1076 "International Security Cooperation: Redefining the U.S.-Japan Alliance."

B. THE STRATEGIC COMMUNITY

1. MOFA/JDA/JSDF

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs traditionally has had primary responsibility for Japan's international security policy, and management of the alliance with the United States. The Japan Defense Agency, in contrast, has been a weak bureaucratic player throughout most of the post-war period. The top bureaucratic post in the JDA has been held by an official seconded from the Ministry of Finance or the National Police Agency in every case but one, and several of the key bureau directorships have been co-opted by the Ministries of International Trade and Industry (MITI) and MOFA. The JDA has been further constrained by Article Nine (the "peace clause") of Japan's Constitution, and by repeated assaults from the press, the Diet and other ministries, and other regional powers in East Asia. Japan's uniformed military, the Japan Self Defense Forces (JSDF), have faced even greater political and cultural obstacles, in addition to being subjected to the bureaucratic control and personnel decisions of the JDA.

The relative power balance between JDA/JSDF and MOFA began shifting in the 1980s, however, and over the past two years this trend has accelerated. The first hint of increased JDA autonomy in the Japanese system came in the early 1970s when the reversion of Okinawa to Japan and the anticipation of U.S. withdrawal from the region after Vietnam inspired an "autonomous defense" movement under then-Defense Agency Director General Yasuhiro Nakasone. However, MOFA and the traditional political opponents of the JDA in the Diet quickly suppressed this movement by reasserting the primacy of Japanese security dependence on the United States. Ironically, this led to closer defense ties between U.S. and Japanese military forces in the 1980s in response to increased Soviet military capabilities in the Far East; this eventually enhanced the clout and professionalism of the JDA and JSDF within Japan's political system. In the post-Cold War era, JDA and JSDF have taken further steps to assert their positions in national security policy making. The most significant of these steps have been:

- UN peacekeeping operations (which were supported by MOFA and most of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party after international criticism of Japan's "checkbook diplomacy" during the 1991 Gulf War);
- expansion of defense diplomacy and exchange with other regional powers since 1992;
- establishment of a consolidated uniformed-civilian Japan Defense Intelligence Headquarters based on the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency in 1996;

- establishment of a "second-track" dialogue with DoD by dispatching mid-level officials to NDU and other U.S. think tanks since 1992;
- equal billing with MOFA in the current review of the 1978 Defense Guidelines (which MOFA dominated in 1978).

MOFA continues to play the lead role in managing Japan's security cooperation with the United States, but JDA is now asserting its own initiative in critical areas of the alliance relationship, as well as in Japan's regional diplomacy.⁴

2. The Political Parties

Paralleling the growing clout of the JDA and JSDF in the 1980s was the emergence of a pro-defense caucus in Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP). The LDP had always had pro-defense hawks within its ranks, but these were balanced and usually neutralized by anti-JSDF doves in the LDP and the opposition parties. The party's defense caucus of the 1980s comprised traditional hawks and more dovish internationalists; this ideological and factional broadening gave the party's defense activists a new role to play in the defense relationship with the United States.⁵

The end of the Cold War sapped the LDP defense caucus of its momentum and when the LDP split in 1993, so did the remaining defense enthusiasts in the party. As Chinese provocations and troubles on Okinawa accelerated in 1995, however, defense issues once again began animating the political debate. The opposition New Frontier Party (many of whose members are former LDP) formed security policy committees that began pushing the government to be more forthcoming in defining Japan's military cooperation with the United States. The LDP responded with its own special hearings and reports. The LDP's Policy Affairs Research Council emerged as a particularly important player in the resolution of Okinawa base issues and the initiation of the review of defense guidelines. Finally, the Japan Social Democratic Party's (JSDP) policy apparatus has

⁴ For comprehensive details, see Green, *Arming Japan: Defense Production, Alliance Politics and the Post-War Search for Autonomy* (Columbia University Press: 1995); Joseph Kedell, *The Politics of Japanese Defense* (Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1994); Michael Chinworth, *Inside Japan's Defense: Economics & Strategy* (London: Brassey's, 1993). For an IDA assessment, see Green and Hinkle, "Japanese Views on Security and Counterproliferation" (IDA Paper 3177, March 1996).

⁵ The growth of the LDP Defense Caucus in the 1980s paralleled the growth in Japan's defense budget. The politicians were both cause and effect. Particularly important contributions by the LDP Defense Caucus members were the introduction of sea-lane defense into Japan's maritime missions in 1981 and the break of a one percent of GNP cap on defense spending in 1987.

established a new role as a moderator between the LDP/government position and left-wing members of the JSDP who were reluctant to abandon the Party's traditional pacifist platform when the current coalition was formed with the LDP in 1994.⁶

The fluidity with which Japan's major political parties have mutated and realigned policies in the past year has rendered individual politicians--but especially party policy staffers--as key players in the determination of defense policies. The basic pro-U.S. defense orientation has not changed; if anything, consensus around that principle has strengthened. But on specific defense issues such as the Guidelines review, Okinawan bases, and China policy, the politicians have repeatedly interrupted the traditional patterns for generating security policy through MOFA. New electoral rules for the October 1996 Diet election will add even greater unpredictability for the bureaucrats as Japan switches from multi-seat districts to predominantly single-seat constituencies that could shatter old alliances and constituencies.

3. The Think Tanks

With its strong bureaucracies and continuous single-party rule, Japan never developed influential non-governmental institutions that could offer credible alternatives to government policy. All of Japan's think tanks are linked to a bureaucracy, corporation, or politician. However, with political realignment at home and Japan's increased involvement in international security issues, semi- and non-governmental sources of defense expertise are beginning to make their mark.

- The Japan Institute for International Affairs (JIJA) was established by the Foreign Ministry in the 1980s as a vehicle for informal dialogue on political and economic issues with other governments and their policy research establishments. JIJA has no indigenous defense expertise, but has served as the secretariat (together with the CSIS Pacific Forum) for government and second-track dialogue on defense cooperation with the United States. Under former Ambassador to the United States Nobuo Matsunaga, JIJA also has played a role in "second-track" diplomacy for MOFA with China, South Korea, and Western Europe.

⁶ For the LDP, the key players were members and staff on the Defense Division of the Party's Policy Research Council. For the smaller JSDP, the key players were in the Party's Policy Making Board, who interacted with the LDP and forged an unprecedented (though still patchy) consensus on defense issues with their conservative opponents. The opposition NFP made its voice heard through shadow cabinet meetings and studies organized by former LDP members who still had strong ties to the JSDF and defense industries.

- The National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS) was established by the JDA to conduct research on defense and international security issues. NIDS was a bureaucratic backwater with negligible influence on policy making, until the JDA began hosting exchanges with U.S. NDU and other defense institutes in East Asia the 1990s. Today, NIDS plays a central role in the JDA's new defense diplomacy. NIDS has experts on various aspects of East Asian security, U.S.-Japan defense cooperation, strategy and tactics.
- The Research Institute for Peace and Security does work for both MOFA and JDA on international security policy. Leadership changes and the emergence of other centers of expertise on international affairs have diluted the RIPS' influence in recent years, but the institute's annual report on Asian security has won it attention abroad. RIPS relies on outside academic expertise for specific security issues.
- The Defense Research Center was established in 1992 by a group of former classmates from the National Defense Academy who now work in the defense divisions of various Japanese firms. DRC has research fellows, and borrows personnel from defense industries to do research for JDA on issues related primarily to defense technology policy. The JDA has used DRC for studies on topics that are too sensitive for the government to address directly (e.g., deployment of military-use satellites), but DRC does not have an audience in Japan beyond JDA and a handful of defense-related industries.
- The Japan Center for Strategic and International Studies (JCSIS) also is comprised of former JSDF officers and focuses on strategy and tactics. JCSIS tends to publish reports on aspects of defense doctrine that the researchers feel constrained from writing while on active duty. The Center's reports therefore tend to circulate primarily among active duty JSDF officers and their supporters in the Diet or industry.
- The Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS) was formed by former Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone (the budget was his retirement gift) as Japan's first truly "independent" policy research institute. The bureaucracy attempted to co-opt the institute initially by requiring that most of its staff be seconded from industry or government. Instead of becoming a leash, however, this mandated connection to industry and government has given IIPS a conduit for its research. Nakasone's assertive internationalist stance colors the entire institute and has attracted bureaucrats and scholars eager to develop an agenda for Japanese security policy. IIPS has conducted numerous joint studies and seminars with leading foreign policy and security institutes around the world and has used its collage of visiting fellows to craft influential policy studies that cut across traditional bureaucratic lines. The institute's security expertise shifts with visiting fellows from government and industry, but tends to focus on non-proliferation, regional

security and confidence-building measures, defense posture, and comprehensive security (energy, environment, and the like).

4. Industry

Japan's defense-oriented industries traditionally have played a central role in lobbying for defense production and thus in U.S.-Japan security relations overall. In terms of defense policy, two industry-supported institutions have been most influential:

- The Keidanren Defense Production Committee has been lobbying the Japanese government for changes in Japan's arms export ban to allow greater collaboration with U.S. firms (Keidanren, or the Federation of Economic Organizations, is Japan's major business lobby and surpasses any such organization in the United States in terms of size and clout). In 1996, Keidanren established an industry-to-industry working group with the National Security Industry Association in the United States under sponsorship of JDA and DoD (Acquisition & Technology). Keidanren's focus traditionally has been on defense production issues, but the secretariat is gearing-up to produce studies and work with U.S. institutes on general security policy issues.
- Keizai Doyukai exists as an alternative to Keidanren for policy-oriented business leaders. Where Keidanren generally works through all of its affiliate industry associations to arrive at policy decisions, Keizai Doyukai issues policy recommendations based on the task force meetings of a handful of industrial leaders (generally from post-war success stories, such as Sony or Honda). Keizai Doyukai's policy reports on security frequently are ghost-written by the "ronin" listed below and are not much more provocative than Keidanren's work, but they do tend to solidify consensus within industry for certain security issues.

5. The "Ronin"

Individual experts on defense have attached themselves to non-security institutes in recent years and have emerged as important opinion-makers and advisors for politicians and prime ministers who seek alternatives to government officials. Many of these "ronin" defense experts (ronin were master-less samurai) are former officials themselves. The most noteworthy are:

- former ambassador Hisahiko Okazaki, who is associated with the public relations firm Hakuhodo;
- former MOFA analyst Satoshi Morimoto, who is at Nomura Research Institute;

- former General Toshiyuki Shikata, now at Teikyo University; and
- former MOFA diplomat Yukio Okamoto, now head of his own consulting firm (Okamoto Associates).

6. Other Security Policy Planners

The media, the Ministries of Finance (MOF) and International Trade and Industry (MITI), the National Police Agency, and academics also play a major role in determining Japanese security policy.

C. CONCLUSIONS

The fluidity of Japanese politics and decision making, the growth of JDA's influence, and the expansion of influential defense expertise in non-governmental institutions, all suggest that DoD can--and probably should--engage a broader segment of Japan's national security community. In part, this is because new directions in defense policy require painstakingly slow consensus building (*nemawashi*) in Japan, and there are now more players. In addition, these new players have the right combination of expertise and relative independence to engage with institutes such as IDA on defense policy areas where there is not yet sufficient consensus for the governments to cooperate on an official basis. Bilateral security areas that would benefit from such a second-track approach include:

- counterproliferation
- dual-use technology and armaments cooperation
- contingency planning scenarios
- trilateral defense dialogue and planning with Korea
- base issues
- regional confidence-building measures

There clearly are obstacles to collaborating with Japanese security policy centers outside of the government. There are no institutes in the United States that have defense expertise as broad as FFRDCs such as IDA or RAND. Dialogue or joint research on areas such as counterproliferation or confidence-building measures therefore would have to be run through one institution in Tokyo with individual experts invited from throughout the

community. In addition, the national security community is still much smaller in Japan than it is in the United States. Japanese defense experts are being overwhelmed by the demands for consulting, conferences, and meetings.

On the whole, however, DoD's agenda for defense cooperation with Japan increasingly requires broader patterns of engagement in Tokyo. The U.S.-Japan Alliance has a long way to go before catching-up to the intimate defense relationship that characterizes the Anglo-U.S. Alliance, but the trajectory is in that direction, and the connecting strands are increasingly available.

III. REPUBLIC OF KOREA

A. TRENDS IN STRATEGIC THINKING

1. Korean Domestic Politics

Korea's domestic political realignment and democratization process have evolved rapidly since the inauguration of the current administration under President Kim Young Sam. Two trends that are particularly relevant to Korea's strategic relations with other nations are President Kim's military reform and the emergence of a new generation of Korean politicians who hold different views than their seniors, especially on national interests and strategy.

In the presidential election of December 1992, Kim Young Sam defeated his long-time political rival, Kim Dae Jung. This election was a watershed event in Korean politics for two reasons. First, Kim Young Sam was the first civilian president since the 1960 military coup of General Park Chung Hee. Second, the election was the fairest and the most open election in Korea's history. President Kim's first task was to eliminate the legacy of military rule and influence in Korean society and politics, and he has vigorously pursued this goal throughout his tenure. This political reform had at least four consequences: (1) many military leaders were purged (more than 60 top generals lost their jobs); (2) the military came under civilian control, with President Kim as the commander; (3) a large measure of transparency was introduced into military decision making (weapons acquisition, personnel appointments, and strategic planning); and (4) civilian experts were introduced into military planning and management (appointment of outside experts to work closely within various bureaus and offices inside the Ministry of National Defense).

The results of these changes have been mixed. On the positive side, Korean politicians and common citizens for the first time feel secure that the military will stay out of politics; there is little chance under foreseeable circumstances that another military coup will occur (as in 1960 and 1980). On the negative side, the military's morale has been severely damaged, producing potentially serious consequences for military preparedness and modernization. In 1996 President Kim began to loosen his grip on the

military and tried to boost morale when he realized the trade-off between political reform and national defense considerations. The new military leadership and working-level managers in the military establishment appear to appreciate the reduced level of civilian pressure on the military mandated by this new presidential initiative, and morale appears to be improving.

The other important trend in strategic thinking is the emergence of the younger generation of political and military elites who are more nationalistic. The unquestioned assumption that Korea should rely on the United States for its national defense, an assumption held by the majority of conservative Korean elders, is rapidly becoming unpopular. To these younger Koreans, Cold War thinking and business-as-usual policies are not acceptable. They favor dialogue with regional and subregional powers, reexamination of the U.S.-Korean security alliance, re-assessment of threat perceptions, and pursuit of 21st century strategic choices consistent with the national interests of a reunified Korea, not just South Korean national interests.

2. Regional changes

Over the past decade, economic, social and political changes in East Asia have been dramatic, and these changes affect the strategic thinking of Korea. The four major powers most influential in Korea's strategic thinking are China, Japan, Russia and the United States.

a. China

Korea is the fifth largest investor in China, after Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan and the United States. Bilateral trade with China has steadily increased (to \$16 billion in 1994). Frequent high-level visits between Beijing and Seoul have become a sore point in Pyongyang. The only missing link between China and South Korea is a military link. Although a proposal to jointly develop a medium-size commercial aircraft has been shelved, the two countries show every intention of promoting industrial and technological cooperation. China's current military drive to become the major power in Asia has caused Korean leaders to re-evaluate the importance of China to South Korea and the region.

Two schools of thought about China exist in Korea today. One view is that China is the source of Korean culture and civilization, and Chinese are different from the aggressive Judeo-Christian civilization of the West. As long as Korea regards China with proper respect as the origin of Confucian culture, China will not pose a threat to Korea.

The contending view is that China is a socialist giant vigorously pursuing its national interests. It has no special regard for Korea, and must therefore be watched carefully. In their debates, both schools present simplistic views of China. For Korea, an important strategic consideration is China's attitude toward re-unification.

b. Japan

Korean sentiments and national policies toward Japan have evolved from extreme anti-Japan sentiment to today's let-us-be-neutral attitude, although an underlying hostility can still be tapped on subjects such as "comfort women" or wartime "slave labor." However, Koreans recognize that Japan has its own problems. It is undergoing its own political reform, as conservative old politicians give way to young reform Turks. The maturing Japanese economy is experiencing the post-industrial society syndrome: labor shortages, demographic change, hollowing out of the manufacturing sector and rising of service and knowledge-intensive industries etc. The "new Japan" presents Korea with the task of formulating new Japan policies.

The most important change in Korean thinking toward Japan is that Koreans feel for the first time that they are ahead of the Japanese in terms of political reform and recognition of the importance of the individual versus the group. While this self-assessment of Koreans on their relative political progress may be overly optimistic, one positive impact of this new thinking is that the possibility of cooperating with Japan in case of a national contingency (i.e., a North Korean contingency) can now be entertained, since the two governments are seen as more politically equal. Another development is the emerging discussion between Japan and the United States on regional burden sharing and peace keeping. The revised National Defense Program and the U.S.-Japan Joint Declaration on Security concern the fate of the Korean Peninsula, and Korea must consider its role in this context.

c. Russia

The most important outstanding issue between Seoul and Moscow is how to handle Russia's debt to Korea without loss of faith or face in either country. In the first years of the post-Cold War era, Korea was elated to establish diplomatic and economic relations with the reforming Soviet Union, and offered loans of up to \$4 billion. Russia, which has inherited the debt, has not even kept up with the interest payments, and wants to pay back the loan with weapons, many of them obsolete.

In Korea, Russia is considered a second-echelon nation whose national interests mostly lie in domestic affairs rather than strategic and international relations. In this sense, Russia poses neither threat nor promise to Korea. The primary strategic significance of Russia is its role in a multilateral security arrangement that would include the Korean peninsula.

d. The United States

The love-hate relationship that Korea has with Japan is also descriptive of Korea-U.S. relations. Thorny issues such as the Status of Foreign Forces Agreement (SOFA), defense burden sharing, base relocation and defense industry cooperation bedevil the relationship. Bilateral issues are complex and interdependent, but one basic new development that has prompted Korean leaders to reexamine the bilateral relationship has been the emerging triangular relationship between the United States and the two Koreas. South Koreans are becoming increasingly suspicious that the United States will move toward an equidistant policy between the two Koreas in pursuit of American interests, disregarding South Korea's interest in reunification.

3. Summary

These regional trends, along with domestic political developments in Korea, fuel continuing debates in the Korean strategic community. Much of this debate is framed and conducted in Korea's major research and policy analysis organizations.

B. KOREA'S STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND POLICY ANALYSIS ORGANIZATIONS

In Korea, the government allows each ministry to operate its own think tank or research organization. The budget appropriation process is similar to that of the United States, with one main difference, i.e., that each ministry has its own agenda and sets the budget for its think tank. The budget is approved (only superficially and formally) by the government; it later goes to the Korean parliament, where the think tank must defend it before receiving pro forma approval.

1. Korea Institute for Defense Analyses (KIDA): a Defense Ministry Think Tank

KIDA's professional research staff are the main source of reports, briefings, and memos for the Ministry of National Defense (MND). The president of KIDA typically is a retired army lieutenant general who plays a symbolic leadership role, a Korean example

of the Japanese concept of *amkudari* (descent from heaven: a retired government official hired by the private sector, primarily for his government connections). KIDA's current president and his predecessor, however, receive good evaluations from the research staff as hands-on managers and astute planners and strategists for the organization.

In the past, KIDA has been subservient to the MND. All of KIDA's funding comes from the MND, which sets the research agenda and commissions specific projects. Objectivity in research has sometimes suffered. Criticism of the MND was not welcomed; meaningful two-way communication was lacking. But new research staff members at KIDA have begun to challenge this relationship with MND, and in our meetings at KIDA we were told (informally) that the overall research environment has improved significantly.

Regardless of its shortcomings, KIDA remains an important think tank. Many of its senior members are famous and well respected, and publish in professional journals. Many researchers are engaged in cooperative research with international scholars. Perhaps the most critical challenges for KIDA and MND are to establish an institutional mechanism safeguarding research objectivity, and to promote a culture that encourages individual researchers to pursue vigorous investigations on defense and strategic questions. Fewer restrictions on discussing research findings (other than classified subjects) will also encourage KIDA staff to work with outside experts.

Among KIDA researchers, notable experts include: HWANG Dong-Joon (defense industry and technology cooperation); CHOI Kang (arms control and strategy); CHOI Sung-Bin (weapons systems and cost analysis); JEON Kyong-Mann (public policy and military policies); KIM Chang-Su (U.S.-Korean relations); KIM Seong-Bae (aerospace industry); KIM Tae-Ho (Chinese military strategy); KOO Bon-Hak (North Korean studies and arms control); and OH Kwan-Chi (North Korea's military strategy and military economy).

2. Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS): a Foreign Ministry Think Tank

IFANS is headed by a chancellor, usually a senior diplomat who is awaiting his next assignment to a major country like the United States, Japan, or China. As a think tank for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), IFANS conducts studies on national security and unification; China; Russia and Eastern Europe; Asia and the Pacific; Western Europe, Africa, and the Middle East; and the international economy.

In addition to this research, IFANS offers academic programs for career diplomats and foreign service personnel. Three important areas in its academic program are professional studies and job training; special courses; and foreign language courses.

While some research staff are diplomats between assignments, most research staff are social scientists with doctoral degrees from the West, and their main task is research and policy analysis on a range of issues from U.S. alliance management to APEC. IFANS' most important annual tasks are: (1) stage two bilateral international conferences, one with the United States, China, Japan, and Russia; the other with the European Union; (2) publication of monographs and conference proceedings; and (3) provision of policy suggestions to various bureaus of the MFA.

Notable IFANS researchers include: KIM Kook-Chin (U.S.-R.O.K. alliance and strategic studies); LEE So-Hang (arms control and political CBMs); and YU Sok-Ryol (North Korean studies). The younger scholars at IFANS are very promising.

3. Research Institute for National Unification (RINU): a Ministry of National Unification Think Tank

RINU is the youngest of the government's major political think tanks, and one of the most rapidly developing research organizations, thanks to its main research agenda--unification and North Korean research. Most of its research staff are social scientists, many of whom received doctoral degrees from Korean universities in conformity to a new policy of the Korean parliament, because RINU is the only think tank whose budget must be endorsed by the parliament (rather than set by the ministry). RINU's active annual publication schedule includes about 30 independent monographs, several conference proceedings, five annual journals, six biannual journals, three newsletters, and series of policy studies reports. It is rapidly becoming the most important think tank on Korean unification and North Korean strategic studies.

RINU's top manager is usually a retired high-ranking government official (deputy prime minister or cabinet secretary level) or a notable scholar. Since its research topics are of especial interest to the Korean public, many researchers receive considerable public attention, and become moderators of national debates on unification and North Korean issues. Among its staff, well-known experts are: SUH Jae-Jean (sociology of North Korea); CHON Hyun-Joon (North Korean politics and elites); JHE Sung-Ho (North Korean human rights and judicial system); NAMKOONG Young (North Korean

economy and trade issues); CHEON Seongwhun (arms control and nuclear issues); and OH Seung-Yul (North Korean economy).

4. Research Institute on National Security Affairs (RINSA): a Think Tank of the National Defense University)

RINSA is very similar to INSS of the NDU in Washington, DC. Its administrative office is located inside the National Defense University and its members are faculty and research associates. While it is not an autonomous institution as are the other think tanks, it is a very important outlet for debates among NDU faculty members, graduate students, and research associates. Its current director is a well-known strategist, and faculty who have recently joined NDU make RINSA an important center of research and fresh thinking, especially on the subjects of defense industry and technology issues and strategic studies.

Notable experts at RINSA include: LEE Sok-Ho (military strategy); HAN Yong-Sup (U.S.-Korea alliance and arms control); KO Soon-Ju (defense industry); and HWANG Byong-Moo (Chinese military strategy).

5. University-Affiliated Research Centers

The two most famous and active university-affiliated research centers are IFES (Institute of Far Eastern Studies) at Kyongnam University, and the Center for Unification Research at Yonsei University. Both host many conferences, seminars, and lecture series with both domestic and foreign experts, and provide a forum and facilities for research on current strategic and political issues.

C. POTENTIAL COLLABORATION PARTNERS FOR IDA

IDA's limited research manpower on Asia-Pacific area studies and its short history of Asian engagement should be considered in the formulation of a "two-track" network and joint cooperation plan. We do not want to advertise our interest before we are certain of our ability. The first task is to establish a good working relationship with KIDA. During the past several months, IDA and KIDA have had numerous contacts: (1) IDA's formal visit to KIDA in June; (2) a KIDA delegation visit to IDA in August; (3) a KIDA research member's week-long training by CARD in August; and (4) KIDA's China specialist's seminar in September. The ground work is laid for future cooperation.

IV. SINGAPORE

A. INTRODUCTION

For a tiny island nation with a population of only three million, Singapore speaks with a loud and confident voice on regional security issues. As with the Mediterranean city states of the Renaissance, Singapore has been forced, by history, to develop a sophisticated strategic community and an intimate understanding of its more powerful neighbors. The Singaporeans claim to know the United States, China, and the rest of ASEAN better than any other state in South East Asia. Singapore's modern economic system and multi-ethnic population lend credibility to these claims, as does the high visibility of the nation's research institutions and diplomatic activity. While other ASEAN states engage in quiet defense cooperation with the United States, Singapore is the only member of the Association that now hosts U.S. military facilities. And despite its high profile spats with Washington over human rights issues, Singapore is the leading advocate in South East Asia for a robust U.S. presence in the region.

From the perspective of DoD, Singapore is a small but strategically important friend. It hosts U.S. forces and provides a window and a harbinger for U.S. security relations with the rest of ASEAN. Singapore's sophisticated--and expanding--strategic community provides opportunities for the U.S. to build on this strategic relationship through second-track dialogue. From the perspective of Singapore, second-track dialogue could offer a controlled interaction with Washington that does not undermine the nation's non-aligned status as a member of ASEAN.

In order to explore the nature of Singapore's strategic community and the potential for expanded second-track dialogue, interviews were conducted in Washington and in Singapore, with representatives from the Institute for South East Asian Studies (ISEAS), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), the Ministry of Defense (MINDEF), the U.S. Embassy in Singapore, and other independent academics and journalists.

B. SINGAPORE'S STRATEGIC OUTLOOK

Singapore's national security objectives are to:

- cultivate friendly relations with neighboring countries;
- establish a defense posture that will deter possible aggressors by making Singapore too “painful to swallow;” and
- strengthen the social cohesion of its multi-ethnic population.

Singapore’s birth in 1965 was the result of ethnic and political tensions that led to separation from Malaysia and economic sanctions from Indonesia. As a result, Singapore has attempted ever since to “defeat its enemies by making them friends.” To a significant degree, Singapore’s efforts to redefine relations with Indonesia and Malaysia have succeeded. ASEAN’s growing political and economic cooperation have been accompanied by bilateral military cooperation that has further built mutual confidence and trust (although multilateral military cooperation continues to elude ASEAN because of divergent threat assessment).

Singapore has reached beyond its immediate ASEAN neighbors to establish relationships that further add to the stability of the city state’s immediate environment. Where the rest of ASEAN members (and particularly Indonesia) have made it a diplomatic objective to keep non-South East Asian powers out of the region, Singapore’s view has been that a crowd is much safer. Singapore has moved well beyond its neighbors to invite India into the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) for example, and to encourage a robust naval presence from the United States in South East Asia.

Singapore measures changes in U.S. regional policy on an extremely sensitive scale. The experience of defeat and abandonment under Great Britain--first in 1941 after London said Singapore could not be conquered by Japan, and then in 1971 when the Royal Navy shut down its base, despite decades of promising not to--have colored the Singaporeans’ perspective on Washington. Singapore clearly sees the United States as a benign and stabilizing superpower, and actively argues for the U.S. presence to other ASEAN powers (whom the Singaporeans report are also increasingly appreciative of the U.S. presence). Singapore also allowed the United States to establish military facilities on the island in 1990 after the ejection of U.S. forces from Clark and Subic Bay. Although the U.S. military presence is modest (and is described officially as “engagement, not presence”), Singapore took considerable heat from other ASEAN powers for signing an MOU with the U.S. in 1991.

At the same time, Singaporean MINDEF and MFA officials make no secret of the fact that their planning assumption has to be a U.S. withdrawal from Asia. China, they

point out, will always be in Asia, but the United States could leave at any time. Singaporeans point to the U.S. budget deficit, societal problems, and even business practices to support their contention that the United States may not have staying power in East Asia. Ironically for American diplomacy and strategic engagement, this abiding Singaporean skepticism about U.S. staying power is often a source of leverage. As long as the government of Singapore fears a U.S. withdrawal while still depending on a U.S. presence, U.S. proposals for new modes of strategic engagement will receive a fair hearing.

Since 1991, Singapore has expanded its interaction with DoD in three areas: staff talks; joint training; and foreign military sales (FMS). FMS in particular has helped to integrate Singaporean and U.S. military approaches to regional security problems. Singaporeans report that the rest of ASEAN also is enamored of the U.S. high-tech military edge. Malaysia, once loathe to accept U.S. military support for ideological reasons, now sees little advantage in relying on SU-27's over U.S. fighters for its defense. In terms of joint training, Thailand has always had joint exercises with U.S. forces (such as Cobra Gold), but increasingly Malaysia is quietly allowing U.S. naval access to facilities. Indonesia took a major step away from its traditional non-alignment policies in 1993 by applauding the U.S. military presence in its annual White Paper. Sensitivities toward China and to traditional non-alignment principles still hamper overt defense cooperation with the United States, but the trend throughout ASEAN is in the direction of strategic appreciation of the U.S. military presence and subtle cooperation with U.S. forces, and Singapore has helped to pave the way.

For Singapore, the United States is a crucial balance against possible Chinese subregional hegemony and--perhaps more importantly--a check on resurgent Japanese military aspirations. Thus, Singapore, more than any other ASEAN power, applauded the April 1996 U.S.-Japan Security Declaration. Expanding Japan's rear-area support role for U.S. forces in a regional contingency struck most Singaporean observers as a reasonable step to maintain U.S. equity in the alliance and to keep the U.S. engaged in Japan. Singapore also has led ASEAN (with the exception perhaps of Malaysia's Mahathir) in calling for Japan to play a larger role in the region as a civilian power. When channeled through the U.S.-Japan Alliance and in the direction of "soft power," a more confident Japan does not trouble Singapore. Japanese military missions independent of the U.S. are deeply troubling for the city state, however, and Singaporeans openly admit that while their concern with China is strategic, their reaction to Japan is more visceral.

As with much of the rest of the region, in recent years Singapore has undergone a subtle transformation in its thinking about China. Singaporeans thought they understood Beijing well (through the ethnic tie) until Lee Kuan Yew and other senior delegations were rebuffed by the Chinese leadership after urging caution on the Taiwan Straits issue in March of 1996. Think tank scholars and officials at MINDEF and MFA now acknowledge that their best hope is not to influence Chinese planning, but to remind Beijing of its own interests in interdependence through trade and investment. At the same time, Singaporeans continue to think that they can have some influence on U.S. planning, and therefore urge the United States to avoid confrontation with Beijing over Taiwan--reminding Washington that the missile tests in March were an internal Chinese matter and that the military is not acting independently from Jiang Zemin and the civilian leadership.

Singapore's worst case scenario for the Sino-U.S.-Japan triangular relationship would be Chinese aggression in the Spratley's, which in turn would prompt anti-Chinese (and therefore indirect anti-Singaporean) reactions in ASEAN, and then U.S. pressure on Japan to play a greater military role in the region. Singaporeans note that China did not object to the 1991 MOU with the United States, and that good relations with Washington and Beijing are possible. Government officials are understandably reluctant to discuss what Singapore would do in a direct Sino-U.S. confrontation, but private researchers argue that Singapore and ASEAN might return to the original non-alignment tool of asking every major power to leave the region in such a scenario.

Uncertainty about the future of Sino-U.S.-Japan relations explains Singapore's enthusiasm for the ASEAN Regional Forum. Small states adept at diplomacy tend to favor multilateral institutions to begin with, and to the extent that ARF helps to integrate China, it is seen as valuable, regardless of the actual outcome or product of the talks. Singapore was therefore highly critical of Secretary of Defense Perry's proposals earlier in 1996 for an Asian defense summit, and his suggestion that APEC (the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation forum) might someday turn to security issues. The U.S. impatience with multilateral processes that produce no agreements or concrete measures confounds Singapore, which sees opportunities to integrate not only China, but India (which Singapore supported for ARF membership, despite opposition from Muslim Indonesia and Malaysia), and eventually North Korea. For Singapore, which rebuilt its relationship with Malaysia and Indonesia through ASEAN, the process of talking is, itself, a form of national security.

C. SINGAPORE'S STRATEGIC COMMUNITY

"Small" is an unavoidable leitmotif in any analysis of Singapore--including, of course, the city state's strategic community. Singapore's security and foreign policy experts demonstrate an uncanny consistency of message across bureaucratic and academic lines. One can read Lee Kuan Yew's opinions in the *Straits Times* and hear identical analysis in MINDEF, MFA, or think tanks the next hour or the next day. Despite this "group think," however, Singapore's security experts are free of many of the political and civil/military complications of their ASEAN neighbors, and engage in sophisticated analysis of strategic relations in East Asia. Singapore has yet to develop an identical counterpart to IDA, but the "second-track" community's cohesion with the government results in a status not unlike FFRDCs in the United States.

- *The Institute for South East Asian Studies (ISEAS)* is based at the National University of Singapore and was headed until recently by Chan Heng Chee, now ambassador to the United States. ISEAS prepares annual assessments and has a strong regional focus that it reinforces with visiting fellows from the region and the United States. Derek DeCunha is the institute's sole in-house expert on security, and he is well known for his iconoclastic (and usually critical) perspective on U.S. military policy in the region. ISEAS tends toward multilateral and South East Asian issues, and is therefore a useful contact for institutes such as IDA, but not a logical counterpart for research.

- *The Singapore Armed Forces (SAF) Strategic Studies Department* has an excellent reputation for its military education efforts. The SAF Strategic Studies Department has engaged in exchanges with NDU and INSS in the United States, but does not have significant in-house expertise comparable to either INSS or FFRDCs such as RAND and IDA.

- *The MINDEF Policy Office*, because of the ministry's size, has successfully established the consistent policy planning function that has proven so elusive in the Pentagon and the Department of State. The MINDEF Policy Office appears receptive to exchange and dialogue with U.S. defense experts, whether governmental or second track, although personnel and expertise are limited.

- *The Institute for Defense and Strategic Studies (IDSS)* was established in the fall of 1996 in conjunction with the Nanyang Polytechnic Institute. IDSS is led by former Ambassador to the United States, S.R. Nathan. IDSS shows great potential as a counterpart for FFRDCs such as IDA. IDSS is attracting Singaporeans with strategic studies backgrounds and is closely coordinating its program of study with MINDEF.

D. CONCLUSIONS

With the establishment of IDSS, Singapore is moving (in miniature) toward the kind of defense expertise that exists in IDA, although it will be some time before IDSS is able to engage U.S. institutes in the way KIDA does from Seoul. The growth of Singapore's defense expertise is now irreversible, however, and there are opportunities for supporting DoD engagement with Singapore and South East Asia as a whole through research collaboration and dialogue on a second track. Research areas that would resonate in Singapore's strategic community and support DoD strategy in the region include:

- the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA), which underpins overall support for U.S. engagement because the region's armed forces increasingly recognize the advantages of establishing interoperability and armaments cooperation (FMS) with U.S. forces;
- long-term U.S. strategy, which would educate the U.S. side on how the region defines "presence," and educate the Singaporeans on the significance of increased U.S. capabilities;
- China assessments; and
- scenario and wargaming exercises.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

In contrast to other FFRDCs (such as CNA and RAND), IDA has backed into second track dialogue with East Asian counterparts in response to the requirements of sponsors in DoD rather than through a deliberate institutional plan. Given the trends described in this report, there are probably advantages to taking more deliberate steps to facilitate IDA's interaction with counterparts in the region. The management of U.S. security relations with allies falls primarily to OSD/ISA, but ISA does not represent the sum total of OSD's interaction with East Asia. Other elements in OSD are engaging Japan, Korea and South East Asia on: armaments cooperation (A&T/ES); space policy (PDUSD-Space), counterproliferation (ISP); and force requirements (S&R). In addition, sponsors of IDA research throughout DoD require assessments of strategic and technological issues in the region.

There are several steps that could be taken to mark IDA as a center for strategic dialogue with East Asia, both in the region and in DoD. These include:

- tapping into the growing number of IDA staff, adjuncts, and consultants who have frequent interaction with institutions in East Asia;
- encouraging "courtesy calls" between IDA management and counterpart institutions in the region (on the heels of other conferences or business trips, or through a deliberate effort);
- accommodating visiting fellows or researchers with an unclassified research area in the building;
- hosting international speakers at IDA (for example, in the President's Forum);
- holding internal country seminars for IDA division chiefs to learn more about existing exchanges and to consider new modalities for engaging counterparts in East Asia (a good example is the September seminar on Korea organized by Bill Cralley and Kondang Oh).

IDA's unique relationship with DoD will limit the extent to which the institute can open its doors to engage counterparts in East Asia. Nevertheless, just as globalization is forcing U.S. business to develop deliberate strategies for the East Asian

market, IDA can expect new requirements and opportunities in the region under its mission for DoD.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE*Form Approved*
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE September 1996		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Engaging East Asia's Changing Defense Elites				5. FUNDING NUMBERS Independent Research Program	
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael Green, Kondang Oh, William E. Cralley, James Delaney					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard Street Alexandria, VA 22311-1772				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER IDA Document D-1924	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard Street Alexandria, VA 22311-1772				10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The study examines the impact of East Asia's changing national security establishments for U.S. regional strategy and considers the opportunities for IDA to develop second-track exchange with emerging counterpart institutions in the region. The study focuses on Japan, Korea, and Singapore.					
14. SUBJECT TERMS Japan, Korea, Singapore				15. NUMBER OF PAGES 38	
				16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR		